
A
DEFENCE
OF THE
Dean of St. Paul's APOLOGY
FOR
Writing against the SOCINIANS.

DECLARATION
OF THE
Dean of St Paul's APOLOGY
FOR
Writing against the Socialists.
by Rev. J. H.

1954-12-4
(3) 664

A
D E F E N C E
O F T H E
Dean of St. *Paul's* A P O L O G Y
F O R
Writing against the S O C I N I A N S.
I N
A N S W E R
T O T H E
A N T A P O L O G I S T.

W. Sherlock
L I C E N S ' D.

L O N D O N :

Printed for *William Rogers*, at the *Sign* over-against
St. *Dunstan's* Church in *Fleetstreet*. MDCXCIV.

DEFENCE

OF THE

PROSECUTION

FOR

THE

IN

THE

ANALYSIS

OF THE

Printed for the Proprietors, at the New York Office,
25, Nassau Street, in New York, M.D.C.C.LXV.

1

A
D E F E N C E
O F T H E
Dean of St. Paul's A P O L O G Y
F O R
Writing against the S O C I N I A N S.



NE would have thought, that when the Ancient Doctrine of a Trinity in Unity, had not only been contradicted, but openly scorn'd and ridicul'd with as little Modesty as Sense, it had been no unpardonable Crime to undertake the Defence thereof: But it seems a certain *Stander-by* being a little touch'd with Melancholy, could not bear such an Attempt; for this is to *litigate touching a Fundamental*; and that is to turn it into a *Controversy*; that is, to *unsettle, at least endanger the unsettling the whole Superstructure*. So that when some *Learned Writers* took upon them to chastise the Insolence of these Busy and Factious Underminers of Christianity, who in the opinion of any one that is not overrun with *Melancholy*, must be thought by their

B

bold

EARN. SMIT.
P. 7.

bold Attempts upon the *Fundamentals* of our Faith, to have endeavour'd *the unsettling the whole Superstructure*; this *Stander-by* was put into a sudden Fright, to see men so unreasonable, as to write in Vindication of a Fundamental Article of the Christian Faith, which it becomes *Peaceable* men rather tamely and silently to give up, than to *litigate* concerning it: And therefore he addresses in *An Earnest and Compassionate Suit* to the *Learned Writers* in Defence of the Churches Doctrine, to hold their hands, and forbear at least till *a fit time*.

But it seems All men had not the same Sentiments of this *Peaceable Design*, as the *Melancholy* Author of it had; nor could the *Compassionate Suit* work its hop'd-for effects on the minds of All *Learned Writers*. 'Tis no wonder therefore that the *Dean of St. Pauls* was not thereby discouraged from resuming the *Defence of the Catholick Faith*; but only thought it necessary, *before he ventured to dispute these matters any farther, to make some Apology for Disputing*; and to show, that notwithstanding what this Author endeavours to persuade the world, it is neither *Unchristian*, nor *Uncharitable*, nor of *Dangerous Consequence*.

Antap. p. 1.

But this *Apology* of the *Dean's* did, it seems, stir the Spleen of our *Stander-by*, and move the Choler of this *Peaceable and Modest Person, who would* (but it seems he could not, especially towards the Church of England) *observe the common Rules of Good Manners*: And therefore we must not blame him, if in his Reply to the *Dean* we do (notwithstanding his designing the contrary, and *composing his Mind as far as he was able*) meet with *Bitterness, Passion, Cavilling, Insolence, and Ill Language*; fortho he will *not pardon such things in himself*, (and therefore 'tis to be hop'd will do private Penance for them) yet it may become us to pardon them, and let it pass,

pass, as he says too many do, for a *Point of Justice in such case, calcare fastum majori fastu*. And besides, since he owns, that 'tis not without difficulty that Human Nature forbears rendering an Angry and Disdainful Reply to Haughty and Ill-natur'd Answers, or those which are fancied to be such; if he does now and then do so himself, we may suppose it was because he could not help it, and therefore it is excusable; for I hope the Plea which he makes for Hereticks, may serve also for himself; and if a man must Conceive as he can, and Judge as he can, and Believe as he can, so he must also Write as he can.

And this I think will also be a sufficient Apology to our Author, for my not being of his mind; for since I must conceive as I can, and judge as I can, I find that for my life I cannot judge his Discourse to be either rational or well design'd; but rather, as he would fain have the world think of the Endeavours of other *Learned Writers, Unreasonable, Unseasonable, and of Dangerous Consequence*: And therefore without any farther Compliment, I shall venture to bestow some short Remarks upon it; in which I shall also confine my self to the main Design of the Book, which is, (as we shall hear him confessing himself anon) To dissuade men from Writing in Defence of the *Doctrine of the Trinity*; and therefore I shall not think my self concerned to enlarge in the Confutation of those Arguments against the *Dean's Hypothesis*, which ever and anon he gives us into the bargain; for my business is only to consider what he says in Defence of his *Peaceable Design* of persuading All men, as well as the Dean, not to write in Defence of the Truth, if he thinks it so.

But I must desire one thing of *Our Author*, That because he falls foul on the *Dean* for pretending to know his *Intent*, when he wanted the *Gift of discerning Spirits* Ant. p. 11.

to capacitate him for being a Judge of it, he would take notice, That I do not pretend to know his inward *Intentions* any more than his Name. And therefore whatever I shall say in my Reflections, let him not pretend that I do it to *calumniate* and *inodiate* him, since all I have to do with, is his Book.

But now let us come closer to the purpose, and be plain and succinct, as far as our *Author's* intricate way of Writing will permit, who begins (as he also goes on) with heavy Accusations against the *Dean* for his *Bitterness, Insolence, Ill Language, Indignities, False Imputations, and at least seemingly malicious insinuations against himself*: Whether all this be true, and whether the *Dean* in any place treats him with greater Sharpness than such a Writer deserves, must be left to the Impartial Reader to judge.

One of the *False Imputations* with which he charges the *Dean*, is, That he says, *He called the Socinians learned Writers of Controversy*, whom he now protests he did not mean by that Character: And tho his Title-Page be so ambiguous, that it might easily be mistaken either for a *Suit to Learned Writers*, or for *Forbearance to Learned Writers*; yet I am apt to believe him, because he has not dissuaded the *Socinians* from Writing against the *Trinity*, but other *Learned Writers* from Writing for it: A good Orthodox Excuse.

But waving this and many Instances of the like Disingenuity, he will present here the main State of the Cause betwixt the *Dean* and himself; which in short is this, That the *Disputes touching the Controversies of the Holy Trinity*, might be at present let alone, till fit time and place; I suppose he means only by the Orthodox Writers, who defend that Doctrine; for he himself protests, that by *Learned Writers*, to whom he addressed his *Suit*, he did not

not mean Socinians : *And to persuade to this, he had said, This particular Controversy is of all others at present most unreasonable, most dangerous, and most unseasonable.* This may pass for a state of the Question ; and I will leave it to the Reader to judge upon the whole, whether the Dean has not quite overthrown this state of his Question, and sufficiently demonstrated the Weakness of all he urged.

Now he is desirous to know, *Where is the mischief of all this :* For all that he designed was plainly no more then, to move for Peace, at least for a Truce, till both Parties were calmed, and might calmly Treat. But, methinks, the fairest way for this had been, to desire both Parties to hold their hands, and not only to beseech one to be silent, and let the others Write, and Talk, and Rail, and Argue on too as well as they can against the Established Doctrine. But methinks this very project of a Truce does not seem very reasonable, for it looks as if he thought the Church and the Socinians to be upon equal terms with one another, which I can by no means grant ; because the Church of England, in this Point at least, has had Sixteen hundred years prescription, besides the Authority of Scripture and Reason on her side. Nor can I think any Treaty lawful in such Fundamental Points, but that all Catholick Christians are bound to do what they can by Reason to convince these men of their Errors, and reduce them into the Bosom of the Church ; for I do not like our Authors way of Compounding with Hereticks and Shismaticks, and I hope *Posterity may find better Expedients for Uniting of Protestants,* than for the sake of Peace to give up truth.

But here though our Author could bear, what he thinks a *modest and just reprehension,* yet he is very angry with what the Dean says, and looks upon it as *imperious beyond*

S

P. 4.

beyond measure, especially when the great Argument of all, is no better than a *petitio principij*, that the Doctrine of the Trinity, as Dr. Sherlock hath stated it, and does defend it, is a fundamental of the Christian Faith. Now this I take to be a false imputation upon the Dean, who does indeed, as the Church of England does, look on the Doctrine of *Three Persons* and *One God*, as a *Fundamental of the Christian Faith*; and this he endeavours to vindicate from those Absurdities and Contradictions which are charged upon it, and gives such an Explication of it, as though he believes to be true, he does not lay down as necessary to be expressly believed by all; nor will he esteem any man a Heretick who sincerely believes the Doctrine of the Church, that there is but *One God* and *Three Persons*, though he does not subscribe in all things to his *Hypothesis*. And therefore I think the *Antapologist* is fallen into a fit of *Melancholy* when he complains of the Dean, because in his Apology he quits his Adversary, and neglects all that has been said against his Novelty, and falls upon exposing the Peaceable man. Now I should rather have wondred, if in an Apology for Writing against the *Socinians*, he had entred into the main subject of Debate, when his only business was to show the weakness of such *Earnest Suits*, as desired that no man should Write any thing in the present Controversy; so that I cannot but think the *Antapologist* is a little, if not besides himself, I am sure a great deal besides the purpose, to make it a matter of Accusation against the Dean, that he keeps close to the proper Subject of his Discourse; for I would here only ask him, Whether in his *Suit* he undertook a Confutation of the Dean's Hypothesis? If he did not, then I hope his Book may be pertinently Answered, and solidly Confuted too, without entring into the merits of that Cause. I would ask him also, Whether

ther he did not Address to all *Learned Writers against the Socinians in this Controversy*, as well as to the Dean? And whether what he urges be not level'd against any man's Writing in Defence of the Established Doctrine, as well as of the Dean's particular Hypothesis? If so, 'tis plain that the Dean did very well, not to run out into a Vindication of his own *Hypothesis*, or of the Doctrine of the Trinity in general; *but to fall upon exposing the Peaceable man*, as our Author terms it; that is, to show the insufficiency of all his pleas for Forbearance towards the *Socinians*, and betraying the Christian Faith, under the pretence of *Peace and Moderation*.

But the Dean does not like that the Faith should be stated in Scripture Language, but would have School-terms pass as Fundamental in Faith, as well as his own new Definitions and new Notions. As to the first of these things: The Dean does, and that on very good reasons, desire, whether the *Melancholy stander-by* can admit it or no, that the true Faith, under what words soever it be expressed, and not merely the sound of Scripture-Words, should pass for Fundamental; and thus far he is for *School-Terms*, or any Terms that fix the true sense of Scripture: But as to the other branch of this Accusation, 'tis false and ridiculous, and that is answer enough to it. As for the *uncertain signification of Philosophical Terms*, methinks he should not quarrel at that, which may afford his Friends the better shelter, and permit every one under the same words to couch his own meaning.

And it seems in what he writ, he did not contest either of these Points; and yet in the very Page before, he complains of the Dean, because in his Answer he did not offer one Word to prove his own new Notions; which yet he owns he did not contest with him, and is still as willing as ever to decline engaging, but only in his

his own defence he can't forbear declaring, *That the Dean has to his power overthrown the True Catholick Faith of the Nicene Creed, as much as Philoponus or Joachim ever did; nor will his Invention of Mutual Consciousness clear him from the Charge of inferring Three Gods, since that can infer only an Unity of Accord, &c.* This he says, but does not here go about to prove it, because *these things require more Words than the present Design admits,* and it may be more Reason than he is Master of; and therefore 'tis as easy for me, and as allowable to say, *That the Dean's Mutual Consciousness does infer more than an Unity of Accord,* as for him to say it does not: And that it does infer full as great, if not a greater *Unity of Substance and Nature,* than the words of the *Nicene Creed* express; and if it were not for the Reason which he himself has given, I should not care though I ventured to dispute this matter with him at large.

Ant. Sect. 3.

As for his next Section, I do not know well what to make of it; 'tis long and full of Quotations, but to what purpose, he who writ it may possibly know best.

Ant. p. 5.

In the first place, I think he would have none but Scripture-terms made use of in stating this Doctrine; but this, whether it were the Invention of Old Hereticks, or New Ones, hath been shewn to be in our Case very foolish and unreasonable, and what none would contend for, but he that either knows not what he asks, or has a mind to overthrow the true Faith.

Ant. p. 5.

The next thing, as near as I can guess, that he endeavours to shew from *Fathers, Schoolmen, and Protestant Divines* is, *That the word Person is equivocal and uncertain in its signification;* I hope then his *Clients* may like it the better, as being able to make use of it in a sense agree-

agreeable to their own Doctrines. But after all this *Uncertainty* of the word *Person*, about which he has shown so much Learning, as far as I can find there is so much of its Signification agreed to on all hands, that the *Antitrinitarians* are unwilling to use it, as evidently including something that will not go down with them; and I fear that this is the true reason of our Author's Quarrel against it.

But now our Author has shown himself such a Master of Books, he can't forbear stepping a little out of the way again, to show himself as great a Master of Reason, and therefore falls foul upon the Dean for contradicting himself, for making *Three Minds* and *One Mind*, and making *the Persons Distinct*, and *not Separate*, which is to him an *unavoidable Contradiction*: And who can help it if it be? What the *Dean* maintains, is not so to every body's apprehension; especially if it be considered in his own words, without our Author's Comment on them; for it may be understood how *Three Minds* are *One*, tho it be something difficult to apprehend *that they are three fames, and not three fames*: And I can no more understand our Author's arguing, *That if they are Distinct, they are Separate also*, than he can the *Dean's*, when he says *they are Distinct and yet not Separate*; which I believe will not found like an Absurdity to any but a *Socinian Understanding*.

But if the *Dean* has been mistaken, and has fallen short in his Arguing, and has also set up an Hypothesis full of Contradictions, which yet there are a great many Wiser men than our Author do not believe, what would all this be to the Design of our Author's Book? If *Dr. Sherlock* does not argue well, must no body therefore write, that can argue better? If his Hypothesis be unreasonable, is it therefore unreasonable to write in De-

fence of the Doctrine of the Trinity? Or is the Doctrine it self unreasonable? Some men we know think so; and this may by several strokes in his Book be suspected to be the Opinion of our Author.

However, he is so great a Lover of Peace (why then does he quarrel so much with the Orthodox Writers, and the Church of *England*?) that he is willing to admit *the old way of speaking, and the Ancient Notion of a Divine Person*, as being *more consistent and less obnoxious*: Which if it had been kept to, he had forborn his Suit: 'Tis the New Notion then that he quarrels at; but why then must all men be desired not to write in Defence of the Doctrine of the Trinity, even tho they do hold to the old Notion?

But *h. re* (that is in the Ancient Notion of a Person) or rather in that Word, since it has been a long time in use, without ever defending or explaining the thing) *he would have our Divines stop for Peace sake*. And I believe they will gratify him so far, as not to enter into any farther Disputes about it, if he will secure that the *Soci-nians* shall not oppose this, but subscribe to it, and not write against it. Now he would persuade us, and so it may be he might if we had never seen his *Melancholy Suit*, or did not understand *English*, That all he desired was, that *men would stop at the Ancient Notion*, &c. when 'tis plain to any *English* understanding, that he desired a great deal more, *viz.* That no body would write at all in Defence of the Ancient Faith, or *Ancient Notion of a Person*, though our Adversaries do daily affront and ridicule the Doctrine of the Church, and the *Ancient Notion* too. For I only desire to know, Whether the ridiculing the *Athanasian Creed*, which was the occasion of Dr. *Sherlock's* Vindication, be not ridiculing the *Ancient Notion*. This being all his harmless Design, he is very angry at the

the Imputation of *Disguised Heretick*, &c. What he is, I determine not, but I am sure he writes just as if he were such an one; and since he has not set his Name, I can't apprehend it any ways uncharitable to suspect so much of an unknown Author, of whom we have nothing else to judge by but his Book, which I am sure will never prove that he is any thing better, and does well deserve to have a Brand set upon it, that unwary Readers may not be deceived by it. And this I believe, whatever he doth, very few Orthodox Hearty Asserters of the Catholick Faith, will think a *Calumny*.

Now for the Dean's *New Hypothesis* again, who did not keep within bounds, and stop where he ought to have done, but must needs be rambling, and therefore he must have a lash or two for that. And for the Reader's great Edification, our kind Author will give an account how far he had read of the Dean's Book when he writ, which, and several other as weighty Accounts of himself and his private Concerns, I leave to the Reader that has Curiosity enough to peruse them.

But the Dean holds that which necessarily infers Three Gods, and in his *Apology* goes beyond himself, as in his *Vindication* he went plainly beyond and contrary to the Doctrine of the Fathers, Schools, and Protestant Divines. Pray what's the matter now? Why, he calls the Son a God Incarnate, and the Holy Ghost a God; and therefore infallibly by vertue of this little Particle *a*, there must be Three Gods, all the world can't help it: For tho he expressly says, These Three are but *One God*, and proves it too, yet as long as he says the Son is a God Incarnate, there is nothing can vindicate him from the Imputation of Tritheism; and therefore he must according to his Promise, *thankfully correct this Absurdity*, now it is so plainly shown him.

But does a *God Incarnate* signify any more, but that he who is Incarnate is God? Which if we were always to deal with such Criticks, is a much safer way of speaking, than to say he is *God Incarnate*; for among those who own a Trinity of Divine Persons in the Godhead, a *God Incarnate* can signify no more, than that One of the Divine Persons, who is really and truly God, is Incarnate; but to say *God Incarnate*, might be abused by such perverse Criticks to signify, That the whole Trinity, which is the One God, is Incarnate.

The next Complaint of *our Author* is, That the Dean charges him with desiring that no body would write against the Socinians: And pray is not that the design of his *Melancholy Suit*? To most mens apprehensions I dare say it is; nor do I find that he himself makes any exception against the Truth of the Charge; he does not say it was not his design, tho it is very *iniquitous* in the Dean to charge him with it, because *whatever his Intent was*, he has given us two admirable Reasons why it cannot be concluded from his Book. The first is, That *others as well as Socinians are Heterodox in this Point*: But the Dean and Dr. Wallis writ only against Socinians, and he owns his *Suit* was chiefly to them, and no body else is particularly named in his *Suit*, and therefore the Dean guessed pretty right, and had some reason for his guess. *2dly. These are not the only Points in which they are Heterodox*, and therefore the Doctor had liberty to write against them in other Points: But still was not he and every body else desired to forbear them in these their principal Errors? And did the Dean charge him with any thing more? For in this present Controversy what had he to do with their other Errors? And yet I believe many at least of his Reasons for not writing, will hold as well in other Points as in this of the *Trinity*.

P. 11.

In the next place he gives an account why he stiles himself a *Stander-by*, which does not become any Divine of the Church of *England* in such a Fundamental Article of the Christian Faith. The first Reason he gives, is his mean opinion of his own Skill in the Controversy, but it is modestly express'd with a *perhaps*, and therefore *perhaps* it was his ill opinion of the Controversy it self. His next Reason is, That every one who is skill'd at his Weapon *must not draw upon every one he meets begirt with a Sword*, but if they draw upon him, or to take it out of the Metaphor, assault the Catholic Faith, which every Christian is concern'd in, and every Divine concern'd to defend, it does not become him to be a *Stander-by*, but to use his Skill to defend himself and his Faith; for to be a *Stander-by* in such cases, in plain *English* is to be a Neuter; and when there is a dispute of Faith, if a Neuter be not a Heretick, he cannot be Orthodox, for he is on neither side, if we can suppose a Medium between these two.

In the next place he does not like to be thought *tender on the wrong side*; but certainly he is so, if he means any thing that he speaks. He readily owns what I believe no body will lay to his charge, That he has shown a *Tenderness to the Church of England and the Nicene Faith*; I suppose by those severe Reflections which he makes upon both, and his Burlesque of the *Athanasian Creed* and the Litany, which as yet stand in our Liturgy, and are like to do so, till it fall into the hands of such *Melancholy* Reformers, as out of pure Tenderness for the Credit of the Old Reformation, are for changing the Frame of our most Fundamental Articles, or resolving them all into a mere *Negative Belief*, which is to leave no positive Faith in the Church. And here our Author would know how he is *Tender on the Wrong side*, when he has only express'd

press'd a *tenderness* for the Church of England, the Credit of the Reformation, and for Peace and Holiness; and I'll warrant you, has not said one word in favour of the *Socinian Heresy*, and therefore the Dean may keep his profound politick Notes, of mens *tenderness* being due to their Inclinations, for better purposes: What these purposes are, I know not, but certainly 'tis no improbable conjecture, that men have some *Inclinations* to that, for which they express a great *tenderness*, though 'tis possible this Rule may sometimes fail, and that *tenderness*, which our Author saith he has expressed for the Church of England, may not be due to his *Inclinations*.

P. 12.

But now let us go forward to the next Paragraph, and we shall meet with some farther instances of the Dean's *dissingenuous arts*; who perverts our Author's Peaceable Assertions, and makes what he pleases of them by odious *that is's*, which the Reader must know, is his common way of dealing. A short but heavy Charge this, if it be true; but the comfort is, that he who reads the Dean's Book with his own Eyes, rather than the Antipologists, will find no ground for such an Accusation; for he does no where pervert his Peaceable Assertions, nor do his *that is's* Misrepresent the consequences of our Author's Assertions: And I take it for no *dissingenuous art*, to expose any Assertion by shewing its true meaning, and laying open the just consequences of it. And as to that publick hate, which he saith the Dean endeavours to cast on him, I don't see how that can be, since the Dean has never mentioned his Name, and therefore either did not know him, or had no mind to expose him.

In the next Section he confesses himself an Enemy to such open Disputes between Protestants, as only Publish to the common Enemies the Divisions of the Protestants. And so I believe is the Dean too, as also to all such open Disputes

Disputes among Christians, as have the same ill consequences with respect to the common Enemies of Christianity; and yet I believe neither he, nor our Author, would from hence conclude, That we must not dispute against any Popish Errors, because this *publishes to the common Enemies of Christianity the Divisions of the Christians*; or that, if there be any such *open Disputes*, those who defend the Truth when openly contradicted, must bear the blame of them. As to what he says, That *Voluntary Disputings have never suppressed, but rather revived old Heresies*; If he means by *Voluntary Disputing*, a necessary Defence, as he must mean if it be any thing to the present purpose, 'tis very wisely thought of, that disputing against those who revive and propagate old Heresies, is the thing which *revives them*.

How this Projector for the Churches peace, *would have those who should Write in this Controversy authorized*, he will set down anon, and then 'twill be time enough to admire the wisdom of his Contrivance: Let us in the mean time come to his *Latitude of Faith*, which is another branch of his notable project for Peace, which he still adheres to, though, I think, he has given little or no answer to what the Dean urged against it; so that the Dean's Arguments hold good still notwithstanding his Exceptions against them: Nor are we one gram the wiser for all that fine Lecture which he here reads concerning *Latitude*, as a Metaphorical term derived from *Astronomy, Geography, Triple Dimensions*, or what else you please; nor yet for his citation from one who, I believe, was far enough from *his Latitude of Faith*.

For I can't yet find what he would be at in the present point, unless it be, what he has been already charged with, That every man should be let alone to believe what he pleases, so he doth but profess to believe the
Words.

Words of Scripture, though in never so perverse a sense. This I can't believe is that *Latitude* in which the Apostles left the *Faith*. He says, *To leave Faith in the Latitude in which it was delivered, is to impose no Determinations of such words (i. e. of such words as may carry with them different Notions) as necessary to Salvation, but to allow each Person to believe the matter propounded in one of those senses, whatever it be, which the words naturally bear, and which in his Conscience he judges truest.* This don't seem either safe or reasonable, because a Word or Phrase may naturally be capable of divers senses, and yet it may be demonstrable that in one place it must be taken in one sense, and in another place in another sense; so that to take it in the wrong sense in either place, may be Ridiculous, Absurd and Heretical. Now I am persuaded that the Apostles never intended to leave *Faith* in this *Latitude*, nor was it reasonable they should, for then we need profess but one General Article, *That the Scriptures are true*, and every man should be left to make what he would of them; which would be a pretty and easy kind of Unity of Faith, comprehending all, or at least almost all Heresies, for which some places of Scripture are always urged by their Abettors, which seem to them naturally to signify what they assert, or at least they say so; and our Author has told us in another place, *That we are to believe them in what they constantly profess.*

But if he means only, *That we should not impose any more determinate Signification on such Words, than what the Apostles appear to have design'd them in, nor limit them to such Specialties as they cannot be proved to be limited to in Scripture, we agree with him.* But this will not serve his Cause, for here we must take in the Circumstances of the Place, the Coherence with other Texts, &c. and then we will limit them no farther than
what

what evidently appears to be the true sense of them; and so far we think it reasonable to limit them, and not to leave every one to interpret them as he fancies, and yet be obliged to account him Orthodox, and not to oppose his False and Erroneous Interpretations; which is to permit all Heresies to go on, and never say a word against them.

But I hope he will allow, That all Scripture has some determinate Sense, or else it signifies nothing; and that this Sense in the great Articles of Faith is obvious and intelligible to Impartial, Diligent, and Unprejudiced Seekers, and that as far as this determinate Sense we ought all to agree: For tho in some lesser matters we cannot easily fix this determinate Sense, nor know certainly what it is, and therefore may without any great danger be ignorant, and may own our Ignorance; yet as to the Prime Articles of our Faith, we ought certainly to understand them in some determinate sense; (tho under that *Compass* some *Specialties* may be contain'd, to either of which it is not necessary to determine our Assent) for else indeed we do not understand them at all, and do only repeat a huddle of words when we confess our Faith.

Now if our Author can show me some plain determinate Sense of those Places which we urge, that comprehends under it both what we assert, and what the *Socinians* maintain, only as such *Specialties*, either of which may agree with the natural Sense and plain Meaning of the Words in all those places, I will join with him in desiring no body to write against the *Socinians*, at least not with any Warmth or Zeal, as allowing them to be no Hereticks, nor involved in any dangerous Errors.

In the next Paragraph, because the Dean was not good at guessing, he will explain what he meant by *Simplicity*

of *Faith*, and not any longer *leave it to guess*, though he first of all gives the Dean liberty to take it in what sense he please, even in that of *Foolishness*, and thinks that *the Apostle would in a sort justify the expression*; but neither the Apostle nor common sense will justify the pertinency of it in this place. He tells us then, that he really meant *Plainness*, *Unmixedness*, *Purity*; and I believe the Dean is as desirous as he, that the Faith should be preserved as *Plain* and as *Pure* as the Apostles left it, and yet I fancy that will not hinder him nor any man else from defending it against the rude Assaults of Hereticks, nor from using reason in its Defence: For the Dean's design is to keep the Christian Faith *Pure* and *Unmixt* from Heretical Glosses, which make it quite another thing than what the Apostles left it, and not as our Author fears, to *vamp Philosophy into Faith*.

But now the Dean must answer for what he has presumed to say in favour of the *Schoolmen*, and must be confuted from his own words, for asking such an unreasonable question, *as, What hurt have they done?* And here he spends Three Pages to show his own reading, and the *Schoolmens* Follies, and particularly those of the *Master* of the Sentences; but I have more wit than to follow him through all these Particulars. In short therefore, I suppose the Dean did not intend to justify every thing that they said, but only thought *they had done no harm by the words Person, Nature, Essence, Subsistence, and Consubstantiality*, which the Dean expressly mention'd, and thought them a good Defence against Hereticks concealing themselves under Scripture-Phrases. And that the Dean did not intend to vindicate them in all things, nor to fix on them the Character of Infallibility, is plain from what our Author cites: And that the use of these words hath done more harm than good, I leave our Author

thor to prove at his leisure; and so pass over all his tedious Harangue against the *School-Doctors*; let him bang them about by himself, and vent his displeasure against them as long as he will, it may be a good exercise, and serve to divert his Anger from the Church of *England* and its Orthodox Defenders: But how he and the Animadverter will agree the matter, I cannot guess.

And it may be 'twas this that mollified his *Displeasure* by that time he came to the Fathers, who otherwise were like to have smarted for the same kind of Folly, but now are like to come off pretty well; and he has given us a reason for it, which I like well, because it argues some Modesty: He owns they are guilty as well as the *School-Doctors*, but his respect would not let him expose their Venerable Names: He has indeed caught them in a great fault, but he is so kind as to let them escape. I am glad he has so much reverence for the Ancient Doctors, I only wish he had as much for the Ancient Faith, and would let that escape his Lashes too.

But the Dean accuses him of not understanding, or not reading the *Schoolmen*. What the Dean there says, I verily believe may be true, but neither does he affirm it to be our Author's case, nor will I, because he now tells us, *he has read them, and thinks he doth generally understand them*; and I had rather take his word, than contest that point with him. Sect. 7. p. 18.

But the Dean says, *he censured even our English Reformers for retaining Scholastick Cramping Terms in their Publick Prayers*; This he denies, but owns that he did modestly wish that they had observed the same Temper as did the Foreign Reformers; which implies, that they ought to have done so, and yet did not, which notwithstanding the Modesty of it, I take to be censuring them. Nay, and is not what follows, *Censuring our Litany and the* Sect. 8. p. 20.

A Defence of the D. of S. Paul's Apology

Compilers of it? If it be not, I am sure the Dissenters themselves never censured it.

But by these *Terms*, the Dean says *he means the beginning of the Litany*. And how comes he to know his thoughts? A very pretty question: For how should any man without conjuring know by his own words, that he meant the Litany, which he prophanely and scornfully ridicules? *But he meant not that alone*; a good excuse; for it seems he meant also *the Preface in the Communion-SERVICE before the Text, &c. on Trinity-Sunday*; that is, *Who art one God, one Lord; not one only Person, but three persons in one Substance*; for that which we believe of the *Glor*y of the Father, the same we believe of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, without any difference or inequality. And has not that *School Divinity* enough in it? And if this be all the hurt in *School Divinity*, it will make every good Christian very fond of it, for it contains the true Christian Faith. But because the Dean has pitch'd upon the other, he will stick by it. Generously done: Now let us see how he defends his Censure. *Luther* and *Calvin* are both called in to help. *Luther* left out that Petition, *O Ho'y, Blessed, and Glorious Trinity, Three Persons and One God*: Of which he confesses the *Lutherans* give another reason, *viz.* That the *German Word* did not so expressly signify a *Trinity*, as to exclude a *Triplicity*; but he will not allow this to be currant; but I suppose they understood *Luther's* reason better than he. And then *Calvin* disliked it also; but so he did *Episcopacy*; and will he think that a sufficient ground to censure our Reformers for retaining it?

But to what purpose are these Citations? Let them be as express as they will, they are no Argument to us, who are no more bound to acquiesce in their Judgment, than our Author is in that of the Compilers of our Liturgy,

turgy, for whom I think he should have as much Reverence, as either for *Luther* or *Calvin*. But other *Foreigners* also, and our *Nonconformist Countrey-men*, have strong exceptions against this part of the *Litany*, which he cannot answer as he would. I am sorry for it, but I hope there are some others in the Church who can. How he would have them answered, I cannot tell, but I suppose he can answer them so as to satisfy himself, which sure cannot be without sufficient reason to justify the Lawfulness of these Forms. And if that can be done, which if it could not, he must be a Hypocrite in using them, I am sure 'tis no sign of a *Tenderness for the Credit of the English Reformation*, to endeavour thus to expose it, and to publish what he thinks to be the Infirmities of it, when this publication can serve no other end than to encourage men in their opposition to, and dislike of the *Establish'd Church*: Certainly it had been more proper to have reserved these Complaints till his fit Time and Place.

But he will grant that these Forms may be used without sin, but yet he judgeth it much safer not to come so near dividing the Deity, and so far to distract Devotion. But must we not then lay aside the Apostolical Form of Benediction in constant use among us, the Doxology, and the Form of Baptism, for fear of dividing the Deity, and distracting Devotion? For in all these there is as express, distinct, and particular mention of Three, I dare not add Persons for fear of offending our Author, as in the Litany. But still he would have these Forms reduced to more Scriptural ones, to bring in our own Dissenters, whom we ought if possible, I hope I may add, by reasonable Methods, to bring in and unite to us.

But here I cannot but observe, that this and a great deal more of his Book, is directly Writing against the received Doctrine of the Trinity, and the Established Worship.

ship of the Church of England. Now what is this to the design of his Book, to persuade men not to Write in Defence of the *Doctrine of the Trinity*? Did he do that, only that he might have liberty to Ridicule and Expose it? I must confess 'tis a good Argument to engage men not to Write in Defence of this *Doctrine of the Church*, if he can make it out, that it ought not to be retain'd. But methinks 'tis such a kind of Argument, that bespeaks a man not so much a *Peacemaker*, as a profest Adversary. And besides, I would ask him, Whether it be less *Dangerous and less Unseasonable at present* for him to Write against the Established Doctrine and Worship of the Church, than for others to Write in Defence of them?

Sect. 9. p. 21.

In the next Section he tells us, That *Unscriptural Words* were complain'd of by the *Fathers*, as well as by *Hereticks*; and by the *Fathers* first, for which he cites St. *Athanasius* and St. *Ambrose*, whom I am not now at leisure to turn over, nor does it seem very material to the present business. St. *Athanasius* he owns Apologizeth for the word *ἐκθεσιον* from the *Necessity* of it; and if that will be allowed as a good reason, I suppose the *Dean* will not desire more in favour of *Unscriptural Terms*, and therefore since our *Author* is willing, I think we had as good let this project stand upon its own merits.

P. 23.

Here then he is very liberal, and will allow us to *Vindicate Scripture from Heretical Glosses*. Why then may we not Write in Defence of the *Doctrine of the Trinity*, and show what is the true sense of Scripture in that Point? And if we may do this, Why is it not seasonable to do it now *Hereticks* are so busy in perverting the true sense of Scripture? And if he will grant us this, the main design of his Book is overthrown. But when we have plainly proved that these words of Scripture contain this sense,

sense, why should we (I suppose he means in our Creeds and Articles) *change the Words?* I will tell him one short reason, if he does not know it already, and that is because, *when we have proved this to be the true sense of Scripture*, so as to satisfy honest and unprejudiced Minds, yet perverse Hereticks may still take them in their own sense, and so we shall be never the nearer the knowledge of their Minds, nor able to distinguish them, unless we require them to profess they believe them in *that sense*, which we have proved to be the *true sense*; and then it must be in other Words; for though we have shown to all reasonable men, what is the true meaning of them, and so made the sense of the words plain; yet the words are the same that they were; and therefore every one who took them in a perverse sense before, may do so still if he will. Besides, why may not any man, who believes that to be the true sense which has been shown so to be, profess his Belief in those terms when required by the Church, as well as in *Scripture Words* which he takes in the same sense?

The Dean urges, *They (i.e. Scripture-Words) may be undetermined, and 'tis necessary to fix their true sense.* But this, says our Author, *is the Difficulty; They may rationally, at least probably, admit of more senses than one, &c.* P. 23. He gives an example of this, which is not very much for his Reputation, because it can serve no other end; but to overthrow the Personality of the Holy Ghost, and his Intimate Conscious Knowledge of God; and were my design at present to dispute the sense of particular Texts, it were easy to show, that it is not the Obscurity of the Text, but his own Inclination, which makes him fancy his Latitude of Sense; but it is a vain thing in such a cause as this to infer a general Rule from a particular Instance: For how many instances soever of this nature.

nature he could give, if he will allow that there are any exprefs Texts for the Divinity of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, which will not admit such a Latitude of sense, (as he must acknowledge if he will allow the Doctrine of the Trinity to be a Scripture-Doctrine) there can be no pretence then, to leave such a Fundamental Article in such a Latitude of sense, that men may either own or deny a *Trinity* as they please.

P. 25.

Further, *He would be clearly for expressing some fixed true sense of all Controverted Texts in such Words as Hereticks cannot pervert, but for two or three Reasons, which are worth hearing: His first Reason is, because he cannot always be sure which sense is most truly affixed.* But can he never be sure of this in any Texts that have been Controverted? If he can, then this is no reason why it should not be done in them. His second Reason depends upon the first, and so must stand or fall with that, for where we can be sure which is the *true sense* of Scripture, there is *no such danger of changing Faith and changing Scripture* by fixing the sense, but the greater fear is of having no Scripture, if you have no determined sense of it. His last Reason, *as urgent as all the rest, is, that we cannot tell where to find such Words as Hereticks cannot pervert.* I grant some Hereticks are so perverse, as to wrest almost any words to their own sense, or else the *Socinians* could never have wrested such plain Texts of Scripture, and forced them to comply with their Notions. But that some words have been found that *Hereticks could not pervert*, is I think undeniable, since they have and do frequently refuse to subscribe to them and raise such opposition against them; as for instance, the *ὁμοούσιον*, which the *Arians* always opposed. Now if these words did not plainly contain such a sense as doth expressly contradict their Opinions, why should they not profess their Faith in such words? He

He could assign many words pitch'd upon from time to time, to guard the Faith and prick the fingers of Hereticks, &c. What then? This is no proof that all words can be perverted, or that none were ever pitch'd upon that could not. As to the two words *ἁποστροφῆς* and *Personæ*, pitch'd upon by him, and so learnedly Criticis'd upon, I shall only say in short, that these and such other words as the Church of England delivers her Doctrine in, have prick'd the fingers of some men, or else what makes the Socinians cry out so? There is something plainly signified by them, which the *Antitrinitarians* think not so easily reconcilable to their Opinions as the Words of Scripture are, though it be indeed no more than we say and prove to be contain'd in Scripture; or else why do they not rest contented with them as well as with the words of Scripture? Suppose there are some *Homonymies*, as our Author complains, in some words used in this Controversy; will these words admit the *Heresies* against which they are directed? Will they admit *Socinian* Opinions? Or do they contradict them? If they do, then they serve the end for which they were designed, notwithstanding these *Homonymies*.

Our Author seems to think, *That Words cannot be found to fix the Sense of Scripture*, unless the same words will exclude *All Heresies* concerning the Subject to which they are apply'd, which is manifestly absurd. For if I confess that God is *Almighty* in the most express terms that can be imagined, may I not for all that affirm, that he is not *Just* or *Good*? And must the word *Almighty* be rejected because it does not exclude *All Heresies* concerning the Divine Nature, though it sufficiently exclude all such Blasphemous Notions as make God a weak and impotent Being. Now though I confess *Three Persons* in the Godhead, 'tis no wonder that I may never-

theleſs hold *Heresy, and Blasphemy*, and aſſert Three Gods too; but can I under theſe words mean, that there is not a *Trinity of Perſons*, as *Socinians* affirm?

P. 27.

But *Hereticks* may here conceal themſelves under a larger *Latitude of Expreſſion*, and ſpread their *Heresies* with a *Traditionary Senſe and Comment of their own*, more exactly and more poiſonouſly than the purity of the *Holy Text* would have permitted. How ſhall we be able to deal with this man, who is ſo well ſkilled in the verſatile wit of *Hereticks*, that neither *Scripture-words*, nor all the words made uſe of by the *Antient Fathers* with great *Caution and Judgment*, are able to hold him? I wonder how he knows, what either *Heresy* or *Orthodoxy* is as to the *Doctrine of the Trinity*; when, if we may believe him, there are no words that do determinately ſignify either, but both the words of *Scripture* and *Fathers* will equally ſerve both.

Sect. 11.
P. 27.

But now we muſt return to the *Latitude of Faith*, which the *Dean* tragically complains of him for pleading for, &c. Here our Author is much out of humour at ſome *Queſtions* which the *Dean* put to him; and I do not wonder that it goes againſt his ſtomach to answer them briefly and plainly, though he ſays he will. For upon reading his *Answers*, they appear neither *brief* nor *plain*, nor can I well tell what to make of his tedious harangue for ſome Pages together. The *Dean* asks him, if there be any more *Faiths* than *One*; to this indeed he answers plainly, That *Faith as Truth can be but One*. But then in what follows he makes it neither *brief* nor *plain*; for though he owns there is but *One Chriſtian Faith*, he qualifies it very notably, with *And every Truth which Chriſt and his Apoſtles taught, ought, if it can be without ſcruple underſtood, without ſcruple to be Believed*. Now I would here ask him, if he will not be offended at my preſumption,

tion, whether there be not some Christian Truths which ought to be expressly believed by all Christians? this I believe he will grant, because he afterwards says, that *what is Necessary to the Salvation of all is plain*. This is all we desire, and then let *Protestant Divines be as tender as they will in defining the number of Fundamentals*: The only question to our present purpose will be, Whether the *Doctrine of the Trinity* is not one of these few *Fundamentals* which are necessary to Salvation? And if it be, certainly we may be allowed to Write in the Defence of it, and to require the Profession of it from the Members of *our Church*; and surely what is *Fundamental* in this Point is but *One*, and that wherein all ought to agree; and then the *Faith will be but One*, and no such *Fallacy* in the Deans questions as he complains of. p. 18.

If he will not allow the *Doctrine of the Trinity* to be a *Fundamental*, I think 'tis no hard matter to prove it; but that is not my business, nor according to the design of his Book, is it his: 'Tis upon this supposition we argue, and upon this supposition I would fain see him prove that the *Church* ought not to require an express belief of this Article; but to leave it in such a *Latitude*, as that every one may be *Socinian*, *Arian*, *Sabellian*, or what else he please, and yet pass for a very Orthodox Christian. This I take to be the *Latitude* he pleads for, and which, though in his dialect it be styled *Believing as by Grace we are able*, is really Believing only what we please.

The rest of this Paragraph concerning *different measures of Faith*, as to the present purpose, is no more than mere harangue, *ad populum phalera*; for I cannot possibly understand that it concerns the present Controversy, how God will hereafter deal with men, by reason of their different Capacities and Opportunities of Know- p. 18, 19.

ledg, and what excuses there may be for some mens Ignorance of the most important Truths, &c. And I dare affirm, that all he urges here, *mutatis mutandis*, will be of as great force out of the mouth of a Turk or Deist, to prove that we urge *too strict an Unity*, when we desire them expressly to believe the truth of the Christian Religion.

Suppose, though there is no reason for it, that we should grant him his *negative Belief*, even for the whole Creed, Will that serve *his* and his *Clients* turn? Will his *Socinian Friends* submit to it? Will they then not say a word against the *Doctrine of the Trinity*, nor endeavour to spread their Errors any farther? or if they do, will he give us leave to Oppose them and Defend the Truth?

But now let us see in the next Section, where he thinks, tho upon very unjust grounds, as will appear presently, he has caught the Dean tripping, how *piti-fully* (to use his own Phrase) and *pedantically*, as well as unreasonably, he triumphs and exults over him, and endeavours to expose his *Subtilty*, as he calls it, in saying, *That if the Faith be One, there can be no more Latitude in the Faith, than there is in an Unit.* Now sure this is no such Metaphysical *Subtilty*; for if the Faith be *One*, 'tis plain there can be no more Latitude in it, than in an Unit. But now for our Author's great Discovery, without any *Subtilty* in it, *There are*, says he, *as many sorts of Units, as there are of Unities*; and then he reminds the Dean of *Philosophical and Arithmetical Units or Unities*, which you please; and what *Latitude* there may be in an *Unit*. Suppose all this, the Dean doth not, as I can find, say there is no kind of *Latitude* in an *Unit*, but only that *there can be no more Latitude in the Faith, than there is in an Unit*; which if it be *One*, must be so. But then
I pray

Seft. 12.
p. 30.

Apol. p. 8.

Antap. p. 30.

I pray, what is the *Latitude* in an *Unit*, considered as an *Unit*? None, I think; for in whatever respect 'tis *One*, 'tis no more than *One*, and has no *Latitude*. A *Compositum*, which is a thing he imagines the Dean may have heard of in *Philosophy*, tho, as he says, it has *Parts*, yet is but *One Totum*, and in that respect has no *Latitude*; and an *Hundred* is but *One hundred* and no more; and therefore as an *Unit* it is but an *Unit*, and has no *Latitude*. And if the *Faith* be *One*, as *One*, it can have no *Latitude*: If the *Unity* of the *One Faith* be only an *Unity* of *Words*, then there is no *Latitude* of *Words*, and we must comply with our Author's Fancy, and never profess it in any other words than the words of *Scripture*: But if it be an *Unity* of *Sense*, (as one would think 'tis most reasonable and most proper it should be among intelligent Creatures) then we must agree in the same *Sense*; and if we do not agree in some *One Sense*, we do not agree in the same *Faith*, tho we do use the same *Words*; and if we do agree in the same sense, 'tis no harm tho we happen not to use exactly the same words, and then there may be very good reason sometimes to make use of other than *Scripture-words*. I believe then there is no *Latitude* in an *Unit*. Yes, but there is, and in the *One Faith* too, especially as by the *One Faith* we understand what Churches and Doctors have now made it. What Churches and Doctors have made the *One Faith*, if any of them have made it more than our Saviour made it, concerns not us, we justify no such things. But what is this to our purpose? Sure these Churches and these Doctors do still require an *Unity* of *Faith*, and allow no such *Latitude* as our Author contends for; nay, I fancy he really thinks they urge too strict an *Union*; and yet this for want of a better, must be made an Argument to prove, That there is a *Latitude* in the *One Faith*; and is it not a stab-

bing

bing one? Some Doctors require more things as Articles of Faith, than really are so; ergo there is a *Latitude in the One Faith*. But sure this is no sign that *these Churches* and *these Doctors* allow a *Latitude* in the *One Faith*, if they make it stricter than Christ or his Apostles made it, much less that Christ and his Apostles allow of any such Latitude of Faith.

P. 38.

But *have we not whole Systems of Opinions now-a-days made up into Confessions of Faith*? Yes, we have several Systems of *Arian, Socinian, Pelagian, Calvinistical* Opinions, and all of them require a Subscription at least from their Divines to these several Systems, without allowing his *Negative Belief*, which is a certain proof that they do not allow his *Latitude of Faith*; and from hence to prove that the Scripture words have no determined sense, and are not to be believed in one determined sense, is to prove that the multitude of Heresies destroys the certain and determined sense of Scripture; and I wonder what he means, who pretends to own *One Faith*, to object against this *One Faith* the various and contrary Systems of Opinions in Religion, unless he thinks all these contrary Systems are within the Latitude of the *Unit*, or of the *One Faith*.

P. 31.

And now that this *Latitude* may not pass for his own invention, he tells us, That *God is doubly the Author of a Latitude in Faith*. 1. In revealing his Truth in such terms as admit of a *Latitude of conception*; that is, in not revealing it at all; for if the terms admit of a *Latitude of conception*, i. e. two contrary senses; which is the truth? Both cannot be, and if both are equally the sense of the words, then the Truth is not revealed, but as far to seek as ever. Now for my life cannot I imagine what else this *Latitude of conception* should be, unless he means that God has revealed his Truths, and those too the most

Fun-

Fundamental Articles of Christian Faith (for concerning such our present Controversy is) in such dubious and ambiguous Phrases, that we cannot understand the true sense of them, or at least that very few can, and that even they few cannot be certain that they understand them in the right sense, that is, in that sense which God meant them; tho that is improperly said, for it seems God meant them in none, but intended that every man should believe them in what sense he pleases. This he may call a *Latitude of Faith*, but it is such a *Latitude*, that if I should tell any Infidels of it, whom I would convert to Christianity, they would presently laugh at me and my Faith too.

But in the second place *God is the Author of a Latitude in Faith, in giving to men, as he sees fit, such measures of knowledge and persuasion, as leaves them in a higher or lower degree of Faith, and even of Holiness.* p. 31. This is impious; for in the true consequence of it he charges not only all the Heresies, but all the Infidelity in the world on God Almighty, and justifies both their Heresies and their Infidelity by the different degrees and measures of Faith, or by the No-Faith which God gives them; but I am not at leisure to dispute this now, for it does not concern our present purpose. But if our Author would say any thing either in defence of what he pleads for, or against what the Dean maintains, he must show that Christians are not obliged to profess and believe *one and the same Truth*; that agreeing in *Scripture-words*, tho understanding them in contrary Senses, is sufficient to make Orthodox Christians; that we must not defend the true Faith against such as oppose it, especially if they, or any *Peaceable men* for them, pretend that they *believe as they can, and as by Grace they are able*; and that the Church must not require an open and undisguised Profession of the True Faith.

Now

p. 31.

Now all this, he says, is far from thinking it indifferent what men believe; but very far I am sure from being any Proof of what he pleads for; for there is nothing that can uphold his Cause, but such an *Indifferency* as will not allow the Church to concern her self what men believe, nor her Members to defend the True Faith. But I must conceive as I can, and judge as I can, and believe as I can too; I must not believe what I cannot believe. Very well: And I need not believe any more than I can; and this is true too, if it be not my own fault, that I can believe no more; but if it be, I shall hardly be excusable before God or Man. I cannot; it may be, believe the true Faith of the Holy Trinity; or it may be I cannot believe the Truth of the Christian Religion, as I fear too many now-a-days will be ready to tell you; some Lusts and Prejudices hinder me from discerning the clear evidence of it, and so long I cannot believe, and therefore I hope I shall be excused, and no body will be so quarrelsome as to litigate with me about it, nor go about to confute me, for I believe as by Grace I am able; for though the Gospel be never so true, if God has not given me Grace to understand so much, how can I believe it? For neither I, nor any man alive, who believes any thing, can believe all that Dictating men will impose upon them. But can't he believe what Reason and Divine Revelation Dictate? And who desires him to do more? If the Doctrine of the Trinity be the Imposition only of Dictating men, let him prove that, and we will no longer desire him or any man to believe it. But if it be the plain truth of the Gospel, we will desire him to believe it, and think the Church has Authority enough to require him to do it, though the Church can't make that an Article of Faith which God has not made so: For I hope she can require the profession of that

p. 31.

that which God has made so, and that is all we desire. *But in Controversies the Church may declare her Sense, and we are bound so far peaceably to submit and accept it, as not to contradict it or teach contrary, under Penalty of her Censures.* A very bountiful Concession, for which he deserves her publick Thanks, if he will but stay for them till a fit Time and Place. *And this he would be content (I doubt it not) to conceive the whole of what our Church requires, as to these things, which are merely her Determinations.* Now who can tell what he means by *merely her Determinations*? for I never heard that the Church delivered any Doctrines, especially the Creeds, as merely her Determinations, which would be indeed with a bare face to impose upon the Faith of Christians; but she never pretended to make a Faith, but to teach that Faith which was *once delivered to the Saints.*

But does he really think the Church desires no man to believe the Creeds, and particularly the *Doctrine of the Trinity*, but only not to oppose them? Doth she indeed hand them to us *merely as her own Determinations*? Can any thinking man say so? But if this were all, Do our *Socinians* observe this? Why does not he first persuade them to comply thus far, before he desires us not to defend the Church's Doctrine?

But let us hear his profound Reason; *For in truth it is to no purpose for her to require such Approbation and Consent, which whether paid or no, she can never come to have knowledge, of which sort is Belief and inward Approbation.* Is it then to no purpose to teach men the Truth, because they may put upon us, and say they believe it when they do not? Is it to no purpose to require men to profess their minds sincerely, because we cannot always be sure whether they do or no? This is admirable Logick. We must then never administer an Oath, because we can't
F tell

tell for all that, whether the person speaks the real truth or no. But if this be true, there is no need of disputing a Latitude of Faith, for men may take this Latitude whether we will or no.

But to *exact this may breed Hypocrisy*; not if his Latitude of Faith be allowed, for then men may sincerely profess their Faith in any Words which have Latitude enough to excuse from Hypocrisy, which, if we will believe him, all words have, whether found in Scripture, or used by the Ancient Church. But must nothing be done, from whence bad men may take occasion to be Hypocrites? Then I am sure Vertue must not be encouraged, nor Vice punished, because some may hence take occasion to counterfeit Vertue when they are not sincerely virtuous. And I hope he will not say, That requiring an *inward Belief* makes men *Hypocrites* any other ways; it is not design'd for that end, it does not command nor force men to be *Hypocrites*, and if men will be *Hypocrites*, who can help it? Nay, certainly if our Church required only his *Peaceable Submission* in what she teaches of the *Trinity*, she might be more justly accused of encouraging *Hypocrisy*. For what else would it be, to oblige men daily to worship the *Trinity*, when she does not suppose nor desire them to believe any such thing, and to profess their Faith in Three Persons, when they do not believe one word of that Doctrine? *But it cannot be a Seed of Charity and Christian Concord to exact this inward Belief.* But I think 'tis great Charity to the Souls of men to exact such a Faith as is necessary to Salvation; as for Charity to the Bodies of men, writing against their Heresies breaks no bones. And if by *Concord* he means an Unity of Faith, which is the only *Concord* we are now concern'd about, such a *Latitude* as admits of Twenty several sorts of Faith, can't be this

this *Concord*; and whenever there is such a *Concord*, as an universal Liberty of Faith signifies, which can be only a Civil and Political *Concord*, I desire him to tell me, whether ever he found a greater Unity in the Faith, or less disputing for it.

After some usual Compliments pass'd upon the Dean and his Hypothesis, which deserve to be scorn'd, not to be answer'd, he comes to Dr. Wallis his *Three Somewhats*. The Dean says, *That when Dr. Wallis called the Three Persons Three Somewhats, thereby he only meant, that the true Notion of a Person he did not know*: That is, thattho, as the Doctor says, a Person in *Divinis* is analogous to a Person in *Humanis*, yet by what peculiar name to distinguish them he could not tell, and therefore calls them *Somewhats*; which, as the Dean says, must signify, That Three Persons are Three Real Subsistencies, and Three Real Things, not a *Sabellian* Trinity of mere Names. And if he can think this a good occasion to ridicule the Trinity in our Prayers and Doxology, by the name of *Three Somewhats*, he is not a fit man either for the Dean, or any sober Christian to dispute with.

But now for his *unavoidable consequence of not knowing the true Notion of a Person, that we then worship we know not what*; I have hardly met with any thing more empty and weak. If we have not the true, that is, full Notion of a Person, therefore we worship we know not what, when we worship *Three Persons*: He might as well have concluded; That because we have not a compleat Notion of God, nor of several of his Attributes, as Omnipotence, Omniscience, &c. all which we allow to be Incomprehensible, therefore we worship we know not what, when we worship an Omnipotent and Omniscient, that is, an Incomprehensible God.

Sect. 14. p. 33.

But now since he pretends to own a Trinity, and has ridiculed *Somewhats*, and done little less for the word *Person*; I would desire to know what he worships, when he says that Prayer in the Litany, *O Holy, Blessed, and Glorious Trinity, Three Persons, &c.* And what he means, when he owns *Three that bear witness in Heaven*; whether they be in his opinion *Three Somewhats*, or *Three Nothings*; *Three real Things*, or only *Three Names*? But however that be, *he will not blush to press again his desires to all men to let this Controversy rest, as it was above Thirteen hundred years ago determined by two General Councils.* Pray who are they that will not let it rest? Are they not his Friends who move these *Ancient Boundaries of Peace*? If we must let it rest, persuade them to leave us in quiet Possession of the Truth, and we are content; which sure he ought to do, or else to let us alone in defending it. For I cannot but look upon it as very partial and *iniquitous*, to desire us to let the Controversy rest, that is, not to write in Defence of the Ancient Doctrine, while our Adversaries freely spread Libels against it; and who can imagine *that any man who has any Zeal for the true Christian Faith*, should press this?

As for his Reason, which he thinks *stands unshaken*, I am of opinion that neither the Dean nor any one else had occasion to shake it, it was weak enough to fall of it self. If some men *by the Improvements they have attempted*, have, as he says, *embroil'd this Doctrine*, the fault is theirs; or if some will draw false Inferences from what is well and cautiously said, there is no help for it, as long as there are men of perverse Minds, and weak Heads: But sure all who have writ on this Subject have not *embroiled* it; I have read what some *Learned Writers of Controversy*, besides the present Dean of St. Paul's and Dr. Wallis, have writ on this Subject within less than

Thirteen

Thirteen hundred years, which has not embroil'd nor perplex'd my understanding, but given me much Satisfaction, and made several things clearer to me than they were before. But if this Argument were never so true, it does not prove that we ought not to defend the Ancient Doctrine, but only not to give any new *Explications* of it, lest they should turn the Heads of some men.

As for what he quotes out of the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres*, if it signify any thing more than to let us know he understands *French*, it must be to warn the world against *Mathematicians*, who it seems are very busy in corrupting the Faith with their Notions of *Mathematical Quantities*: I never saw the Book, and am not *Mathematician* enough to be a proper Judge of it; and therefore must refer it to Dr. *Wallis*, who is.

But now he is for carrying on his *Jest* in good earnest, whatever the Dean think of it, and would still have the *Doctrine of the Trinity left on its old Foundation of Authority*; i. e. he would have us yield the Point to the *Socinians*, who he knows value the *Authority of Councils* no more than he does that of the Church of *England*. Sect. 15. p. 34.

The Dean, he tells us, demands of him, *Would he believe such absurd Doctrines as some represent the Trinity in Unity to be, merely upon Church-Authority?* To which he returns an Answer, by which 'tis not easy to apprehend what he means. He says, *he is not press'd with any such absurd Doctrines*: It may be he is not, for I am not sure (tho he pretends the contrary now and then) that he believes any more of the *Trinity* than the *Socinians* do: But if he believes what the Church of *England* teacheth, the *Socinians* I am sure do press him as well as others with pretended Absurdities. P. 35.

Now as for such forms of speaking, as *ἐμμένον*, *Glorified*, and the like, he thinks we must receive them only.

only from *Church-Authority*, and would have those who defend them (which I think he does not care to do) urge nothing else. *The Fathers* indeed, good men, *thought the sense of these words was in Scripture*, and so doth he, admitting what we judge good Consequents out of Scripture, to be of the same truth with Scripture; but poor man he confesses he is not able to prove it, nor to convince others who do not think so; and because he cannot convince them, he thinks no body else can; which may be true, if he knows his men to be convinced; for some men will never be convinced, and some others have as little mind to convince them. But he goes on, *Demonstrate to the world this to be the Sense of Scripture, and the Controversy is at an end.* If he means, prove it by good and sufficient Reason, this we say may easily, and often has been done, and yet the Controversy is not at an end, and I fear never will be, while there are such *Peacemakers* as he is, fluttering about the world. But when he calls upon us to *demonstrate this*, I hope he does not mean Mathematical Demonstrations, unless he has a mind to trepan us into the *Nouvelles*; and as for any other Demonstrations, if he cannot give them, others can, if he will secure them from his *Earnest Suits*.

Well, but if we can't *demonstrate this*, we must own *this to be the state of our Evidence.* We have for the *Orthodox side*, *Scripture interpreted by the Tradition of the Church: This at length resolves it self mainly into Church-Authority.* This were true, if there were no other certain way of knowing the true Sense of Scripture, but Church-Authority; for this sets aside Scripture, and resolves all at last into Church-Authority; and he himself has made that too contemptible to be a sure Foundation for Faith; but the Scripture was so writ by the Divine Penmen, as to be understood; and tho a *Traditionary* Sense

Sense of Scripture be a very good Confirmation of what according to the ordinary rules of expounding Scripture, appears to be the true and genuine Sense of it, yet no Authority ought so far to over-rule us, as to persuade us to believe that to be the true Sense of Scripture, which neither the usual signification of the words, nor the circumstances of the place, nor the contexture of the Reasoning proves to be so. And this was the Question he ought to have Answered the Dean, Whether he would have believed such things as the *Socinians* say are very Contradictious and *Absurd*, and which he himself does not say, are not *absurd, merely upon Authority*, though this Authority pretends Scripture without any Reason to be on its side.

But still he has a farther fetch, which the Dean was so dull as not to smell out, nor I believe would any man else, though he had *attended his words* never so *strictly*; and it is this, that some other *Concurrent Power* should be called in to end this Controversy, I suppose, by imposing silence on all Parties, This carries a show of greater impartiality than our Author usually expresses, for then the *Socinians*, as well as the *Orthodox*, must have their hands tied up. But I doubt this is not such a very fair proposal, when 'tis thoroughly considered; for this must not be done till the Hereticks are first gratified, and the *Forms of Worship, which some mens Consciences can't bear, made easy*, that is, the *Doctrine of the Trinity* thrown out of the Liturgy; thank him for his extraordinary Civility to the Church of England. And then *no matter how severe the Laws be against any who shall write or speak more in the Controversy*; that is, I suppose, every man shall be punished who shall presume to speak one word for as well as against the *Trinity*, and pretend to teach any such Doctrine; for saying any thing of it, either

ther in the Desk or Pulpit, will be *speaking in the Controversy*. Now this I think will not amount to much less than determining the Controversy on the *Socinians* side; for to prohibit the teaching or asserting the Doctrine of the Trinity, or the explaining of those Texts which do assert it, looks very like determining that there is no such thing, or at least that 'tis no matter whether men believe it or no, or in what sense they take the Scripture words, so they do but agree to use the words.

But to proceed with our Author, he professes a great Reverence for the Council of *Nice* (whether in earnest or in jest let the Reader judge) and speaks a great many fine things in behalf of it, not worth repeating. And then he falls foul upon *Athanasius* and his Disputations, taking a hint from what the Dean said concerning *his Learned and Subtil Disputations*, which confounded the *Arians*; of which this Author for brevities sake, and to keep close to the business in hand, gives us a tedious Historical Account, which is many times a very good way of dropping the main Point; besides, that it is always easier to tell a story, than to reason well. And to what other purpose all this Account serves, he may guess that can; for my part I see so little in it, that I think it time lost to consider it any farther. For I cannot understand how it proves, that *the Council of Nice did rely chiefly on Authority*, as our Author asserts; and that *their Faith was not* (as the Dean says it was) *resolved into Scripture and Reason*. When he shows how his Story will prove *this*, which was the thing in debate, I will seriously consider his Quotations, but in the mean time I shall leave him to read his History-Lectures to the walls, and pass on a Page or two farther, where we shall meet with a Masterpiece of Wit and Reason, in some Learned Remarks on the *Athanasian Creed*, which may well

well enough divert a Reader who is disposed for a little Mirth, but will signify little to one that has a mind to be Serious.

But however, he cannot forbear an instance or two of that Creed, to shew how apt that Creed is to lead men to mistake the Truth, and to profess Heresies and Blasphemy. I suppose this was meant for an instance to shew his Tenderness for the Church of England, who owns and embraces this Creed. He has found out a way, (and as far as I know, the Glory of the Invention may be all his own) to prove from *this Creed*, that Two of the Three Persons are not Eternal, but Created, because there is *but One Eternal and One Uncreated*, and therefore Two of the Three must be Created; tho the Creed expressly says of each of the Three Persons, That he is Eternal and Uncreated. Any man, I think, would rather hence conclude, That these Three are One Eternal and One Uncreated, than that Two of the Three are *not Eternal*. And I dare venture any man for making such a mistake, tho he hath a less *Metaphysical* Head than our Author, and less *Grammar* to direct him how to discern when a word is to be taken *adjectively* or *substantively*.

And now he tells us, *Therefore* (i. e. because of what has been said) *he had reason*, as to the Doctrine of the Trinity, not to go beyond the Decisions of the Councils, but to acquiesce in their Authorities; as if that were all he had urged, when 'tis plain that he affirm'd, That it was Authority that chiefly carried the Point in these Councils; and would have us urge nothing but their bare Authority in defence of our Faith; and whether from what he has said, there be reason for us thus to expose our selves for Fools to our Adversaries, I leave every one to judge, who knows what Reason means. So that the Dean's

question was very pertinent, and still retains its first force, for I would fain see this Author show us any man of sense, who *would believe such absurd Doctrines, as the Socinians represent the Trinity in Unity to be, merely upon Church-Authority.*

What farther Authority beyond that of the Church interposed in the Council of Nice, he has no mind to speak: But I think what he does speak, does plainly enough insinuate, that it was not Reason nor Scripture, but Human Force, which carried it, and determined the Point in that Council; and would any man who did not intend to expose both the Nicene Faith and Council too, insinuate this? Let the Dean then be as charitable as he will in his Opinion, I am hard to believe that this was writ with any other design than to expose the Doctrine of the Trinity, and the Church of England, as well as the Council of Nice, which no doubt is much beholding to him, because he would not speak all he knew of it, but leave every one to suspect the worst. And after the same manner I find he is willing to oblige the Dean; for he will also pass by here, as small faults, some Blunders of Mr. Dean's; but not without naming them, for fear the Reader should be so dull as not to apprehend them without notice. One of them, or rather All, is, That he makes St. Athanasius, St. Hilary, and St. Basil (tho I cannot find either Hilary or Athanasius named by the Dean in that huddle of Fathers) to write largely against those Heresies which former Councils had condemned; whereas they all three died when there had but yet one Council sat. This Blunder may, I hope, pass indeed but for a small Fault, or rather, as I take it, for none at all: For as to Hilary, he is not mentioned by the Dean; and then for Athanasius, the Dean a line or two before that huddle of Fathers that sticks in our Author's throat, says of him, that

that he wrote against the Arias after they were condemned by the Council of Nice, which I hope is no Blunder. And then if St. Basil did dye after one Council only had sat, did not the rest there named live and write after more Councils than one had sat? And therefore if some here named writ after one Council, and others after two or more, what Blunder is it to say in general, *They writ against Heresies which former Councils had condemned?* Is not this agreeable to the common form of speech? And yet it may be they might write against some things condemned by more Councils than one, tho not General ones. But however, these Fathers, he says, *are impertinently cited against him;* this I am sure is *impertinently* said; for 'tis evident enough, that what they are cited for, is directly contrary to what he would persuade us to, for *they wrote against Heresies condemned by former Councils*, and that it is for which the Dean cites them; and the *Antapologist*, if I can tell what to make of his Arguments, has all this while been persuading us not to write against the *Antitrinitarians*, because they were condemned by former Councils: Now on which side the *Impertinency* lies, let any other *Stander-by* judge. And thus much, and more than enough, as to his adhesion to the Authority of these Councils; which I can make nothing else of, but that he would have nothing added to the Determinations of these Councils. But all this while how does this prove, That *Authority chiefly carried the Point*, or that we may not write in defence of what these Councils have determined?

And now our Author after all this tedious Harangue should come to vindicate his *Reasons* from those Exceptions which the *Apologist* has made against them; but that is a Task which does not agree so well with him: He has not, I suppose, Leisure and Books enough about

him, being so many miles from his Study; and his *Adversaria* for the proper Month, it may be, are not at hand; and therefore let his Reasons shift for themselves as well as they can these hard times.

P. 42.

As to his Reflections on the Dean (to whom he now wholly applies what he had formerly said in general, against all who write in Defence of the *True Faith*, and for whose sake alone I believe indeed he wrote) for *Contradicting* and *not being consistent with himself*, while he says he has made that Point plain and easy, which he confesses difficult and incomprehensible; they need no very long Answer, for the Dean does not pretend to have made the Doctrine of the Trinity so *easy* and *plain*, as that there is now nothing in the Nature of God *incomprehensible*: Nor doth he say, That so much of the *Mystery* as he has made plain, is *incomprehensible*. It is then no *Contradiction* to make it plain, that there are, and how also there may be without any *Contradiction* to the Nature of an Infinite and Eternal Spirit, Three Persons and but one God; and yet to confess that the Nature of God is *Incomprehensible*.

P. 43.

But now this Controversy is like to be at an end; for says our Author, *Now I may set my heart at rest as to this Controversy, if Mr. Dean will stand to the profession he has made, That all that any man (therefore that he) pretends to in Vindicating the Doctrine of the Trinity, is to prove that this Faith is taught in Scripture.* This, our Author adds, is that which he would be at. And yet I fear the Dean and he would not be at the same thing: The Dean would have it, and has proved it, That the Doctrine of *Three Persons* and *One God*, is contained in Scripture. Now if I can guess at the meaning of the *Standerly*, this very Attempt put him into a Melancholy Fit, and therefore he desires no man would meddle with

with this Controversy. This was the design of his Book, to persuade us not to meddle with this Controversy, but to leave every man to take the words of Scripture in what sense he pleases; and this I take to be different from the Dean's design of *proving this Doctrine to be contain'd in Scripture*; and so the Dean's own *Profession*, tho he stand to it, will not bring the business so near a Compromise. For I doubt, that if we should grant our Author what he says, *That Three such Persons* P 43.
as the Dean has defined, are not asserted in Scripture, yet he would not be so kind to the Church of England, as to grant, that *Three Real Persons* are there asserted, which we know the Socinians deny, and put strained and unnatural senses on Scripture to reconcile it to their Principles of Reason; and did so long before the Dean gave any Definition of a Person, or said one word in the Controversy.

But after all, he has not fairly represented the Dean's words, but has stopped where he thought fit; as if the Dean had only said, *That all any man pretended to, was to prove that this Faith is taught in Scripture*; whereas he went farther, and added, *and that it contains no such Absurdities and Contradictions, as should force a wise man to reject it, &c* This, I doubt, the Stander-by does not love to hear of, *That there is no Absurdity, no Contradiction in the Doctrine of the Trinity.*

In the next Page he proceeds to account for his last reason he assign'd for the present Unreasonableness of some mens P 44.
agitating this Controversy: He should have cleared his Accounts as he went along, and said something more to the purpose in justification of his other Reasons, before he came to the last; but it may be he has a good excuse, and therefore we will be contented to attend his motions. Here then he tells us, *That the Dean calumniates him, when he affirmeth this to be the Sum of his Argument, That*

That to vindicate the Doctrine of the Trinity against Socinians, will make men Atheists. Now I desire any man to look upon his words, and see if it be not so; for he addresseth his *Suit* to All who write in *Vindication of the Trinity*, to forbear writing; and to this purpose he tells them 'tis *unreasonable to controvert* this Point; and the Reason he brings to prove his Assertion, is, *That hereby our Church at present is, and the common Christianity (it may be feared) will be more and more daily exposed to Atheistical men; by what, I pray? by Vindicating the Doctrine of the Trinity.* This is the plain sense of his words, tho now he is asham'd of it, and would have us believe the Sum of all was only this, *Such Vindications as that writ by Dr. Sherlock, he should have added, or by any other Learned Writers of Controversy at present, at least Dr. Wallis, tend rather to make men Atheists, than to convert Socinians.* If this be all he meant, it were to be wish'd he would learn to speak plainer. Why did he not plainly say, he was not against mens writing in Vindication of the Doctrine of the Trinity, but that he only disliked *Dr Sherlock's Vindication*? But whatever the *Doctor's Vindication* will do, I am sure our *Antapologist's* Politick Method for men to agree in the bare sound of words, and no body to know what they mean by them, or to take them in opposite and contradictory Senses, would expose us and our Faith to the just Scorn of Atheists and Scepticks, who by the same Art might subscribe all the Articles of the Christian Creed, and yet believe never a word of the Gospel.

Earn. Suit, p. 7.

Antap. p. 44.

Seft. 19. p. 45.

In the next Section he comes to the *Secret, which the Dean told him*, *That Atheists and Deists, Men who are for no Religion, are of late very Zealous Socinians*; and which the Dean urges as a good reason why we should at present be Zealous against *Socinianism*, and so undoubtedly

doubtedly it is, and a far better than any *he* has urged to the contrary. For the truth of the matter of Fact, 'tis notoriously known, and needs no proof. To invalidate this Argument, I can't find that he has said one word; but instead of this, (according to his usual way of Digressions) he puts off the Reader with an Account of his Friendship and Acquaintance, which he holds with no *Atheists* nor *Deists*, but only with some *Virtuous Rationalists*; and that his *Virtuous Rationalists* do not ridicule this Faith. This *Virtuous Rationalist*, is a new Name, and I am afraid signifies, either a *Deist*, or a *Socinian*, for other Men are not ashamed of their known Characters, and if they do not ridicule the Doctrine of the Trinity, no thanks to their good Nature, nor to their good Manners; they do their best, as he has done, to ridicule it; but it is a Doctrine that won't be ridicul'd.

Thus much for the unreasonableness of this Controversy about the Holy Trinity. In the next place he objects the *Danger* of it; and his Argument for that, is, That it is a *Fundamental* of our Religion: *Now to litigate concerning a Fundamental, is to turn it into a Controversy; that is, to unsettle, at least endanger the unsettling the whole Superstructure.* Now, in Answer to this, the Dean had proved, That there was very great reason to dispute and settle *Fundamentals*, when Hereticks endeavour to unsettle them; and ask'd this Author, Whether the Being of a God were not a Fundamental? And whether that were a good reason not to dispute for the Being of a God, because *Atheists* denied it? This made him ashamed to own his Argument, and therefore he charges the Dean with misrepresenting it. His pretended Misrepresentation is, that he did not say, That the Doctrine of the Trinity was a Fundamental in general, but only, *if duly stated, and therefore*

fore not a Fundamental, as unduly stated by the Dean. This is so trifling an Evasion, that it is hardly worth the while to expose it. Was the dispute, whether the Dean should write in defence of the Doctrine of the Trinity, or whether the Doctrine of the Trinity should be defended? Was his Argument urged to prove, that it was *dangerous* for the Dean, whom he never named before, to defend the Doctrine of the Trinity by his mistaken Notion of it, or that it was *dangerous* to dispute a *Fundamental*? To show the folly of this pretence, let us put his Argument into Mode and Figure, wherein his *Fundamental* Doctrine of the Trinity, as *duly stated*, can be only the *minor* Proposition.

'Tis dangerous to litigate touching a Fundamental, or to turn a Fundamental into a Controversy.
But the Doctrine of the Trinity, as *duly stated*, is a Fundamental:

Ergo, 'Tis dangerous to litigate touching the Doctrine of the Trinity, as *duly stated*.

Now if he will not allow the *Major* Proposition, his Argument is nothing; and if he will, then the Force of his Argument consists in the danger of disputing Fundamentals, and it seems the Dean placed the Force of his Argument right; and if that Argument be good, it is as good against disputing for the Being of a God against Atheists; for the Being of a God is as Fundamental as the Doctrine of the Trinity. So that this limitation of *duly stated*, does not at all concern this Argument of disputing about the Trinity; but the Argument only proves, that we must not dispute about the Doctrine of the Trinity, as *duly stated*, because it is a *Fundamental*, and I suppose, whenever we talk of defending the Trinity, we mean it as *duly stated*. But

But tho the *Stander-by* would not allow any man to defend *Fundamentals*, yet our worthy Primate being not under his Jurisdiction, has ventured to do it. This was then News to him, and *welcome Tidings too*, if we may believe him; and he pretends also to pay great Deference to his Authority, tho one would hardly guess so by the Lash he gives him for Licensing by his Chaplain the Dean's Apology. But what has he to answer this Authority? Why, he hopes in *that Piece* to find (as I hope too by this time he has) *plain and perspicuous Scripture-Notions, clear Reason, and genuine Antiquity*. Will this justify the writing of that Piece? If so, then 'tis not *unreasonable, nor unseasonable, nor dangerous*, to write in defence of *Fundamentals*, and even of the *Doctrine of the Trinity*; but farther, *he was capacitated by his Publick Station, &c.* Very well: And if that will justify him, why will not his approving the *Apology*, justify the Dean at least in writing that Book? And why may not his *Vindication* be as well justified by the Approbation of another, who was also *capacitated by his Publick Station*, either to write, or to License other men to write on this Subject?

His last Argument is the *Unseasonableness* of this Controversy; he says, *All Controversies among Protestants are now unseasonable*; the Dean adds somewhat more, that *they are always so; for there is no Juncture seasonable to broach Heresies and oppose the Truth*. To this he answers, That there may be *Controversies among Protestants, without Heresy*; but it is not easy to conceive any Controversy, but that one side or other must oppose the Truth; and this I believe the Dean thinks always *Unseasonable*; but the present Dispute was about Fundamental Articles, and therefore he had very good reason to mention only the *Unseasonableness of broaching Heresies*. And he seems

to me to urge a very good Argument why no Juncture can be unseasonable to defend the Truth when 'tis oppos'd; For if Hereticks will dispute against the Truth unseasonably, there is no time unseasonable to defend Fundamental Truths. But can any thing be more pleasant than his Proof of the Seasonableness of some Controversies, he might have said of all, even of Socinianism it self, in all Junctures, from the University-Exercises in the Divinity-Schools, where men who are all of a mind dispute with one another, not to oppose the Truth, but to learn how to defend it against the common Enemy when occasion serves? He might as well have proved that Civil Wars are not always unseasonable, because 'tis never unseasonable for Fellow-Citizens to learn the use of their Arms in a Martial Scene, without Bloodshed.

But his Argument why it is so unseasonable in this Juncture, is this, Because, *under God, nothing but an Union of Counsels, and joining of hands and hearts can preserve the Reformation, and scarce any thing more credit and justify it, than an Union in Doctrinals*: Here he complains, that the Dean left out somewhat at the latter end, and therefore I will add it, and it is this, *so above all other Controversies none can be well thought of worse timed than this*; let the Reader judge whether this injured the Force of his Argument, especially since it was afterwards particularly considered. In answer to this, in the first place the Dean asks, *Is the Union in Doctrinals ever the greater, that Socinians boldly and publicly affront the Faith of the Church, and no body appears to defend it?* All that he answers to this is, that he does not love Affronts, especially to the Faith of the Church, and don't know that the Socinians affront it, and is sorry for it if they do; it may be he will not allow writing against the Faith, and endeavouring to ridicule it, to be an Affront, which

which he knew very well the *Socinians* did, if he knew that ever the Dean writ against the *Socinians*, which was in Answer to as Prophane and as Scurrilous a Libel as ever was writ: But whether he will allow this to be affronting of the Faith or no, I suppose he will allow that it is opposing it; which argues no great *Union in Doctrinals*, tho no body should defend it, unless, as the Dean adds, *the world should think we are all of a mind, because there is disputing only on one side, and then they will think us all Socinians, as some Foreigners begin already to suspect; which will be a very scandalous Union, and divide us from all other Reformed Churches.* His Answer to this, (and a very Politick and Grave one it is) as far as I can guess, amounts to this, That if we live good lives, and let our Adversaries alone, the world will credit our *Practice, Articles, Homilies, &c.* and therefore think us no *Socinians*. Now if subscribing the Articles be no more than he makes it to be, they cannot conclude us to be no *Socinians* from our *Articles*, because a man may subscribe them, and yet believe never a word of them; in which case the only way to show that we do believe them, is to defend and vindicate them, and then I believe the world will think us no *Socinians*; but other wise, I fear, *they will*, as the Dean says, *think us all Socinians, which will be a very scandalous Union* indeed.

As to what he says of *Pamphlets dying away, if they were not opposed*; I am not in all cases of his mind, and see no present prospect of it, especially in this Controversy, which so much gratifies Atheists and Infidels: But if these Heresies would in time dye away of themselves, which yet I much question, as not finding that false Opinions always lose ground by not being opposed, what must be done in the mean time? must we all pass contentedly for *Socinians* in the eye of the world, and be

afraid to say we are none? I believe all men would not think this much for the Glory of the Reformation, nor would the Cause of Religion be much beholding to us for it.

But his great Argument to prove this Juncture unseasonable to defend the Doctrine of the Trinity is, That it makes sport for Papists; To which the Dean answers, *It must be disputing against the Trinity then, not disputing for it, for they are very Orthodox in this Point, and never admitt'd any man to their Communion, who disowned this faith, or declared that he thought it at any time unreasonable, dangerous, or unseasonable to dispute for it, when it was Violently opposed.* This he thinks fit to return no answer to, but only to deny that the Dean took any notice of it, but says it was *too warm for him, and that he let it slip through his fingers.*

The Dean observed farther, that if this Argument to prove the unseasonableness of this Controversy in the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity in this juncture, from the necessity of Union of Counsels and joining of hands and hearts for the Preservation of the Reformation, have any Force, it must signify, that we shall *never join against a common enemy, whose Successes would endanger the Reformation, while there are any Religious Disputes among us; which is a confession that every Schism in the Church is a new Party and Faction in the State, which are always troublesome to Government when it wants their help.* He seems surpriz'd at this, as not aware of this Consequence, the truth of which he has not Confidence enough to deny, nor Reason enough to answer, but only senses a little for his beloved Socinians, as a very small inconsiderable Party, and so quiet and peaceable in their Principles, that there is no danger of their disturbing Government: Now if all this be true, it only proves the Impertinency

pertinency of his Argument ; for then we may still write against the *Socinians*, and yet unite Counsels, and join hands and hearts to preserve the Reformation ; of which the *Socinians*, as the Dean before urged, and he thought fit to take no notice of, are no part.

And now passing by some poor trifling reflections, we must come to his mind in a passage of more weight ; but pray, What are these trifling Reflections, which he is so good natured as to pass by ? They are only some Reflections on his Answer to an Objection started by himself in these Words, *shall we tamely by a base silence give up the Point ?* Of which he tells us there is no danger, for a wise Reason, viz. *That the Established Church is in possession of it, and the Adversaries of the received Doctrine cannot alter our Articles of Religion.* Now this Answer is apparently weak, and the insufficiency of it is shown by the Dean in a few words, as indeed a few are enow to do it ; and I suspect he passes by these Reflections upon a very reasonable account, because he could not answer them. I shall not therefore trouble my Reader with the Repetition of them, nor ask our Author any Question for fear he should say, *I fall on Catechising him*, which possibly will not agree with a man of a negative Belief. But it may be the Reader will not be angry, if I ask him a Question or two ; Whether because our Articles oblige us to profess our Faith in the Holy Trinity, this be a good reason why we should not defend it ? And if the *Socinians*, as he tells us, have a Zeal too, no less ardent than that of Church men ; Whether this be a reason why we should by a base silence suffer them to spread their Poyson without contradicting them ? If our Author were to Answer this question, I suppose he would in his *Melancholy fit*, say, yes by all means ; for if no body Disputes with them, they will leave off Disputing ; But will they leave off.

off Perverting the People? Will they leave off making Profelytes to their Heretical Opinions? Nor do I believe after all, that the charms of our Author's *Melancholy Suit* and *Peaceable Rhetorick*, would be able to silence them, though no body should Write against them: For why then did they unprovoked make the first Onset; and, as soon as they thought the times would bear it, openly Disperse their envenomed Libels, which I don't question but they would have done sooner, if they had thought it safe: If our Author had told us, they had no *ardent Zeal*, his argument would have been much more to the purpose; for then indeed there would have been more reason to *neglect them*, since there would have been less reason to fear the spreading of the infection.

Ant. p. 51.

Well, but whether they will leave off Disputing or no, 'tis fit we should, and *neglect them till a fit time and place*, which is the *weighty passage* that the Dean will not *understand*; but however, whether he will *understand* or no, we must wait for *this fit time and place* before we open our Mouths in Defence of the Truth. I wonder our Author would not stay for *them* before he writ against the Deans *gross pack of Errors*, as he is pleased to stile them; for certainly, according to his own rule, he ought to have remained a *Stander-by* (as *Melancholy* as he pleases) till what he himself calls a fit time and place were come. For it seems, tho the Dean thought the *present a fit time*, not upon those Reasons which he himself gives, and which our Author has not Confuted, but as our Author, who, I suppose, by this time has got the *gift of discerning Spirits*, saith, *because he had leisure and a mind to give the world some new specimen of his skill in Dispute, and for other reasons that the world talk of*; yet all these Reasons are not able to convince him, but that the *fittest time and place is a full House*
of

Ant. p. 51.

of Convocation: And if we grant this, may not the present also be a fit time, till the other can be compass'd, tho' not the fittest? and the fittest persons a Committee chosen by that great and reverend Assembly? Here I had a great mind to be at the old way of Questions; but since he is so afraid of being catechis'd, I must, to humour him, put the case *Categorically*; and, besides referring him to what the Dean has already said, tell him what exceptions I have against his Proposals, which I look upon as neither reasonable nor practicable; for certainly there is no great reason why those Doctrines, which have been so long since defined by a *Convocation*, should never be defended against the assaults of scornful Cavillers and Opposers, till a *Convocation* can meet and order an Answer to their scandalous Pamphlets, and then overlook it again before it goes to the Press. And I think the Authority lodged in the Archbishop and Bishop of London to License Books, may be sufficient to justify any man, whom they approve, in Writing in Defence of the Established Doctrine, without waiting for a New Convocation; Or else what was that Authority lodged there for? I hope, not to license Books against the Doctrine of the Church, nor yet merely to license such as do not at all meddle with the Doctrines of our Religion. And if this Authority be sufficient, we know the Dean was thus far Authorized to Write in Defence of the Doctrine of the Trinity.

It seems very hard, that we may not Vindicate the Fundamentals of our Religion from Absurdities, Contradictions, and Falshoods imputed to them, till a Convocation can be called to do it: Which in my apprehension is not easily practicable, unless we could have a Convocation always sitting, which he cannot think either feasible or convenient according to our Constitution: And yet

yet if they are not always sitting, it will be very difficult and troublesome immediately to call them to Confute every Heretical Doctrine that in times of Liberty may be broach'd by Bold and Daring men. When it may be fit to do thus, I leave those, to whom it belongs, to judge; but I am sure 'tis neither reasonable nor practicable every time Hereticks oppose the Truth.

Ant. p 51.

Now by *this method* he says, *All Sons of the Church would and must be concluded.* And are they not already concluded by the *Articles, Liturgy, Homilies, &c.* which he says our Adversaries *cannot alter*? I suppose he would not have us obliged to Subscribe every Line and Tittle in such a Book *revised and approved by a Convocation*, as a Fundamental of Christianity, but only the Doctrines there defined as Fundamental. And thus I think in the present Point, *All Sons of the Church are already concluded* by Subscribing the Articles and Creeds; and if this would do it, as our Author imagines, there would already be a *due end put to these Controversies*. But according to his Peaceable Notion of *Subscription*, by his proposed method, All Sons of the Church would not be concluded any farther then to hold their Tongues, for they might still believe, and inwardly approve the *Socinian* Doctrines, or any other; which though he may think a *due end of these Controversies*, yet few others will.

But after all, How would this *put an End to these Controversies*? If a Convocation should meet and determine on the side of our Articles, and Write a Book to justify the truth, will this *put an End to these Controversies*? Will the *Socinians* be generally Converted any more than they are by Learned mens Writings now? I doubt they would hardly acquiesce in such a Book, though drawn up by our Author, who though he would be favourable enough to them, yet I hardly believe would be able to *satisfy*

tisfy them. Which he thinks will not be, till we can make things plain which are confessedly unsearchable, if not, as some pretend, unintelligible. The plain *English* of which I take to be, That it is impossible to prove the Doctrine of the Trinity so as to satisfy even rational and sober men: And then I cannot apprehend how *his Method* would put an End to these Controversies any other ways, than by a *Negative Belief*; though I very much question whether even upon such terms he could persuade the Socinians to be silent. But still he cannot see any readier Expedient than this towards such an Union, as in the present state of things may be adjudged possible. Indeed I cannot tell whether a real Christian Union in the present state of things, will be adjudg'd possible, or no; nor whether such an Union as our Author pleads for, be necessary for our Affairs; and would be effectual to keep out Popery, and beat the King of France; but I hope both may be done without it: But if such an Union as is indeed desirable, and such as there ought to be in the Church of Christ, be not possible, I know the fault is not in the Church, nor only in her professed Enemies who will not comply, but in such pretended Friends as under the colour of Peace do openly affront and condemn the Faith of the Church, and vilify her Constitutions, thereby hardening and encouraging her Adversaries in their Obstinacy, and giving them hopes, that by their means they shall at length obtain the Terms they desire.

But of this *Negative Belief* enough has been said; only I cannot but take notice of one thing here desired by our Author, That no Practice be imposed upon any, contrary to their Consciences. The meaning of which I take to be, as is plain from several other places of his Book, and particularly from p. 10. of the *Earn. Suit*; That no Expressions should be allowed in the Liturgy,

Earn. Suit.
P. 10.

Ant. P. 51.

Ant. p. 51.

which any one professes are against his Conscience ; nor any Rite or Ceremony required, which all men are not satisfied in ; and so we must part with Episcopacy, and all Order and Decency, to satisfy mens pretences to Conscience. This is a brave *Protestant Reconciler*, and this is admirable arguing for a Church-of-England-man, and one who has read Fathers and Schoolmen. This is such a loose and wild Principle, as if duly adhered to, we must tolerate most, if not all Errors, Schisms, and Vices, that were ever heard of in the world.

P. 52.

Apol. p. 26.

Ant. p. 52.

The next thing we are to answer is a *Captious Question*, with which he pretends to answer the Dean, who as he imagines had put such an one to him. The Dean had ask'd him, *Whether he would allow us, who as he grants, are in possession of this Faith of the Trinity and Incarnation, to keep possession of it, and teach, explain, and confirm it to our people ?* Now because he is resolved to be as *captious* as the Dean, he asks him, *Whether he never saw certain Royal Injunctions assigning fit Subjects for Sermons ?* No doubt but he has : What then ? Why then, *Must they not be obeyed ?* Yes. But what of all this ? To discourse concerning the Doctrine of the Trinity, is not there prohibited. *But is there not the same reason of it, as of those things that are ?* I believe not : For as I take it, the Trinity and Incarnation are more Fundamental Points than the Disputes about Predestination, and more necessary to be believed by Christian People. Besides, the Controversy then was not only with such as wholly denied the Article, but among those who differed in the sense of the Article, while there was something contained plainly in the Article, to which both sides agreed, tho some would have more included in it, than others could find, or would allow to be there asserted. Which Controversy Authority saw fit to silence at
that

that time, since both sides owned the Truth of the Article, which asserted a *Divine Predestination*; and would not let every one in their Pulpits run into nice, useles, and hurtful questions; nor do we desire this should be allowed in the Doctrine of the Trinity. And when he has Interest enough at Court to procure a *Royal Injunction*, that no man shall *write or speak* concerning the Trinity, we know what we have to do; but till then, his *Royal Injunctions* are no more to the purpose than his own Arguments. But however, he will not stand with us for this Point, for *notwithstanding this, he yields that* P. 53.
Ministers should at due season preach to their people the Doctrines of the Trinity and Incarnation; only let them do it plainly, easily, purely, and sincerely, according to Scripture, and not with Innovations of their own. This, if he be sincere and plain in what he says, is all we desire; and if he will promise never to revoke this Grant, we will be satisfied.

In the next place he is for admitting known Socinians P. 53.
 into the Communion of the Church. The Dean had said, He hoped he (the Stander-by) did not propose this Negative Belief, as he calls it, as a Term of Communion; that though we know them to deny the Trinity and Incarnation, yet if they will agree not publickly to oppose and contradict this Faith, we shall receive them to our Communion. Thus far our Author cites; but the Dean had said also, and sling the Worship of the Holy Trinity, and of a God Incarnate, out of our Liturgies for their sake. This he very roundly answers, and utterly confutes, with a short *Why not?* Ant. P. 53.
 This is indeed a short Question, and needs no long Answer; for in the next Page, if he would but look on it, the Dean has given him a sufficient Reason, *Why not?* But he thinks to evade all by putting an impertinent Case, too long to be recited here, and in-

deed not worth it: For it doth by no means reach the Point, which is, Whether the Governors of the Church ought to make the Terms of Communion so large, as that known professed *Socinians* and *Arians* may fully communicate with us as compleat and Orthodox Members of the Church; and not, as our Author gravely puts it, Whether *every Preacher should stop when he sees a Socinian come into the Church*. Besides, he supposes his *Socinian* to be a known good liver, and professing the common Christianity; but it may be we may not agree with him; and suppose I should not be so happy as to think so well of his *Socinian* Friend as he doth, will he then give me leave to turn him out of the Church? But what is all this to the Publick Constitutions of a Church, and the Laws of Communion? Must they be made so loose as to admit all sorts of Hereticks, because an Heretick of any sort may sometimes appear at least to be a good liver, and profess to believe the Common Christianity, &c. as there have been such Professors of other Heresies, and may be of any as well as of this? If our Author answers this too with a *Why not?* I desire he will subjoin a Reason for what he says, and then he may deserve a Reply.

And now our great Champion of wrong'd Innocence, out of his extraordinary Generosity, and love of Peace and Truth, cannot forbear observing, that the Dean wrongs the poor innocent *Socinians*, and imputes sundry Points: very iniquitously stated, to them, which yet they hold not as he states them. And first he tells us, If he (the Dean) as some in the world, had had Personal Dealing with the generality of his Parishioners as to matters of Conscience, he would say, That the Ignorance of many Church-people, and so the Errors of their Conceptions touching God and the Three Persons in the Godhead, much more alter

(as

(as to them) the Object of the Christian Worship.

The Dean, I believe, tho not so unacquainted with his Parishioners, while he had a Parish, yet never met with such Ignorance as this; and yet no man doubts but there are some persons very ignorant, who have no distinct Conceptions of God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, but yet have no Heretical Opinions about them; and I wonder this *Stander-by*, who is so fond of a *Negative Belief*, should not see a difference between a *Negative Orthodoxy*, and professed positive Heresy. By the same Argument he might as well prove, that all other Hereticks ought to be received into the Communion of the Christian Church, because there are a great many Christians that are extremely ignorant in all other Points of Faith. But tho a general, confused, indistinct Knowledge, with a sober and pious Conversation, may qualify men for Christian Communion, yet profest Hereticks ought to be flung out of the Church. The first are the Churches Care to instruct them better, as Opportunity and their Capacities will admit; the others are her profest Enemies, and must be removed from the Church, to preserve the sound parts from infection; and I can't imagine what Notion a man can have of Church-Communion, without Unity of Faith; tho the same Communion may admit of very different degrees of Knowledge.

It would be too tedious, and not very pertinent here, to run thorough these things; but I am sure, for all his haste, the Dean has not in this place imputed any thing to the *Socinians*, but what they avowedly and in Print maintain; for it is evident that the *Socinians* do deny the *Meritorious Sacrifice*, and the *Meritorious Intercession* of our Saviour; that they do also deny that the *Eternal Son* of God Offered himself; that God demonstrated his *Love* to

us by sending his *own Son* in a proper sense, as opposed to a mere Man, or Created Spirit ; and consequently, they do deny the *Humility* and *Condescension* of the *Eternal* Son of God, in becoming Man, &c. and therefore these things are not *iniquitously* imputed to the *Socinians*, which yet are the very things which the *Dean's* Discourse imputes to them ; and therefore he has no reason to add, *That some men Write against them without understanding them* ; but I am afraid 'tis too true, *That some men Apologize for them without understanding them*.

As to the *Socinians* altering the Object of Religious Worship, I refer the Reader to that Discourse of the Dean's, to which he himself has refer'd in his Apology, where he will find that point more largely handled, and fully and clearly Proved.

Ant. p. 55.
Sect. 25.

But now we come to a great Point, and which takes up a great many Pages in our Author, about the Authority of *Parliaments*, *Bishops*, and *Convocations* ; on which Head I have some good Reasons not to be so large, and to desire the Reader's excuse, if I do not follow our Author in all he says on this Subject ; especially, since our proper business doth not require it, and therefore I do not care to ramble like *him*, unless I had the same advantage as he has, to be on the securer side. 'Tis not safe to define what *Parliaments* can do without *Convocations*, or *Bishops* without *Presbyters*. But I am sure the Church has no cause to thank our Author, who would first betray her *Faith*, and then diminish her Authority, even in things purely Spiritual : First, he gives up the Convocation, for what reason is manifest, and for which the Inferior Clergy are bound to thank him : And then he does the same in effect for the *Bishops*, when he allows so much to the Parliament, for they have not so much as a Negative Voice there, and Articles of Faith may be
coined

coined even against the express will of every one of them; and though *he cannot believe the Body of the Bishops disallowed, or did not with good liking consent to the Act of Toleration*; if he does not particularly know this (which it is certain might have passed without any of their Consents, and how many dissented I never enquired) his Opinion, Belief or Disbelief, must be owing only to his Inclination. And if we could suppose (what God be thanked there is no danger of) the Majority of the Lords and Commons to have as little understanding of, and Zeal for the Catholick Faith as our Author has, we might have a *Socinian Creed* made without the Assent of one *English Bishop*, or at least such Articles of Communion framed, as would admit all manner of Hereticks into the Bosom of the Church, and allow all to be Orthodox Christians, that believe but as well of Christ as the *Mahometans* do. And this our Author, at least as far as concerns those *Hereticks*, for whom alone he is Advocate at present, hopes to see done; for he hopes that *Authority, namely King and Parliament, will in time relax what more is necessary for such an Union as is possible to be patched up by a Latitude of Faith, and a Negative Belief*. I hope they will not, and think there is reason to conclude from some late Proceedings, that they will not.

Ecc. Smit. p. 11.

Ant. p. 55.

But we must not pass by his Reflections on the *Dean's wonted Civility*, in Taxing him with *pretending to give an account of Acts of Parliament, as he doth of other Books, without seeing them*. This is indeed very uncivil not to believe a man *except he produces Witnesses that heard or saw him read the Act*; and since he thinks this a hardship, I will not give him the trouble; but I must needs say there was no reason for the Dean to think otherwise before; for by the *account which he gives of this Act*, no

P. 54. Sect. 25.

man

man that thought that he had either Sense, or Sincerity, or Modesty, could imagine that he had ever seen it, but was imposed upon by hear-say, or by a hasty conclusion, that because it was an Act of Indulgence to Dissenters, it must certainly Indulge the Innocent and true Protestant *Socinians* among the rest. This would have been his best excuse, and much more allowable than still to stand to it, That *other Dissenters have benefit by that Act who do not renounce Socinianism*, contrary to the express words of the Act. But let us see how he makes it good, *What then, do you think of a tacit connivance at their stay at home?* I think there is no such *Connivance* allowed by the Act, nor can I believe it is the meaning of the words of the Act, or the design of those who made it. And I am sure this Melancholy Dream of a *tacit Connivance*, is a very *scandalous representation of the Bishops* and of the whole *Parliament*; for this is to tolerate Atheism, Deism, and Profaneness, and to give men free Liberty, not only to be of what Religion they will, but of none at all, if they like that better. But then, *What do you think of a tacit Connivance quietly to come to our Congregations?* This I think is no new favour, but what was always openly allowed to all who were not Excommunicate, and is very far from a *Tacit Approbation* or toleration of their Erroneous Opinions, to let them come thither where they cannot join with us, but they must be supposed to renounce these Errors; for I am sure there is no allowance in the Act for them to join with us only in such parts of our Worship, as do not expressly relate to the Holy Trinity, any more than to hold separate Assemblies of their own, without declaring their Faith in the Holy Trinity. And then for his *Vetus inquiri*, I wonder where he will find it, there is no such thing in the Act, and I believe any

Lawyer

Lawyer will satisfy him, that what Law was in force against *Socinianism* before, is so still, and the same *Inquisition* may be made after them; but if any, whose business it is to discover such Offenders, or punish them when known, will neglect their Duty, 'tis their *Connivance* and not the Law that affords Impunity.

But I wonder what makes him Dream of a *tacit Connivance* for *Socinians*, because they are expressly excepted: 'Tis just as if he should say, the Articles of the Church of *England* give a *tacit Connivance* to them, because they require every man to renounce their *Errors*, and to Confess his Faith in the Holy Trinity. This is an excellent Argument to prove all Hereticks true Church of *England* men, even though they should Write *Earnest Suits*, and enter their *Protests* against Her.

But if this will not do, he now has, and then had in his head (though he had not *occasion* to out with it) another favour shown by the Parliament to Dissenters, not by this Act indeed, but by a former Statute; which took away the Writ de *Haretico Comburendo*, which it seems he was afraid might hurt his *Socinian Friends*, in case some such of their Friends as Mr. Dean, were in the place they affect, but now, he says, he hopes this custom here is in a fair way to be abolished. This is so silly, that I can hardly call it spiteful, for its silliness is an Antidote against its spite; every one knows that Writ was taken away to secure the Church of *England* against the fears of a Popish Successor, which was the only danger of reviving that Writ; which had been so long out of use, that it was hardly known among Protestants: Which argues no great tenderness in

him for the Church of *England* to insinuate so vile an Accusation, as if this practice of Burning Hereticks had been so very customary, that he can still only *hope* that an Act of Parliament can put a stop to it.

His Conclusion is so Rambling, and so very Furious, that I begin to fear his *Melancholy* has some spice of Frenzy in it; and therefore it is time to leave off Disputing, without returning the Compliments or Advice which he has given the Dean at Parting.

F I N I S.

12886 & 13196

ALTERNATIVE BORDERS

12466 2⁵/₆ PERP

TRADE MARK

